

Applicant: Gary Steven Strumolo, et al
Serial No.: 09/580,056
Attorney Docket No.: 199-2102

REMARKS

Claims 21-27 are pending herein. Claims 21-27 were rejected.
Claims 21 and 25 are currently amended.

Claim Objections

Claims 25-27 were objected to on the grounds that in claim 25, "said housing" lacks antecedent basis. Appropriate correction was required.

It will be noted that claim 25 has been amended to omit reference to "said housing". Accordingly, reconsideration of amended claim 25, and claims 26 and 27 as dependent from amended claim 25, is respectfully solicited.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C 103

Claims 21-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynam, U.S. Pat. No. 6,522,451, over Marhauer, U.S. Pat. No. 4,306,770.

It is respectfully submitted that Lynam in view of Marhauer fails to render claims 21-27 obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as hereinafter discussed in detail.

Applicant: Gary Steven Strumolo, et al
Serial No.: 09/580,056
Attorney Docket No.: 199-2102

Lynam in view of Marhauer fails to teach invention of amended claims 21-24

It is respectfully submitted that Lynam in view of Marhauer fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claim 21, and claims 22-24 as dependent from amended claim 21, since those patents fail to teach or suggest "A vehicular mirror assembly...comprising...a mirror...having a first half which is proximate to [a] vehicle and which curves away from a driver of said vehicle and a second planar half which is distal to said vehicle and continuous with said first half...", as recited in amended claim 21 and defined by claims 22-24 as dependent from amended claim 21.

It is respectfully submitted that the Lynam patent fails to teach or suggest that the curved half (55) and planar half (50) of the Lynam mirror are continuous. In contrast, reference is made to col. 6, lines 53 and 54 of the Lynam patent, where it is stated, "Plano element 50 and multiradius element 55 are demarcated apart by demarcation element 65".

It is further respectfully submitted that the Marhauer patent fails to teach or suggest that the planar portion (7) and curved portions (9, 10) of the Marhauer mirror are continuous. In contrast, as shown in Figure 3 of the Marhauer patent, the planar portion (7) and the curved portions (9, 10) of the mirror are sharply discontinuous with each other.

Applicant: Gary Steven Strumolo, et al
Serial No.: 09/580,056
Attorney Docket No.: 199-2102

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the Marhauer patent would fail to provide any teaching, suggestion or motivation to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide continuity between the plano element (50) and multiradius element (55) of the mirror disclosed in the Lynam patent.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Lynam and Marhauer patents, taken alone or in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest rendering a planar portion of a vehicle mirror continuous with a curved portion of the mirror, as defined by amended claims 21-24.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Lynam in view of Marhauer fails to render amended claims 21-24 obvious within the contemplation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Reconsideration and allowance of amended claims 21-24 is therefore respectfully solicited.

Lynam in view of Marhauer fails to teach invention of amended claims 25 and 26

It is respectfully submitted that Lynam in view of Marhauer fails to teach or suggest "A method for increasing the rearward viewing range of a driver of a vehicle, said method comprising the steps of: providing a mirror assembly having a mirror with a planar half and a curved half...coupling said mirror assembly to an exterior of said vehicle, wherein said planar half of said

Applicant: Gary Steven Strumolo, et al
Serial No.: 09/580,056
Attorney Docket No.: 199-2102

mirror is distal to said vehicle and said curved half of said mirror is proximate to said vehicle...", as recited in amended claim 25 and defined by claims 26 and 27 as dependent from amended claim 25.

Reference is made to Fig. 3 in conjunction with col. 7, lines 30-41 of the Lynam patent, where it is stated, "...plano-multiradius reflective element assembly 30 is preferably oriented so that at least a portion of (more preferably a substantial portion of) the reflector surface of plano element 50 is positioned closer to the vehicle body (and hence to the driver) than any portion of the reflector surface of multiradius element 55...".

It is respectfully submitted that the Lynam patent fails to teach or suggest re-arranging the position of the disclosed reflective element assembly on a vehicle in such a manner that the planar element of the assembly is located distal to the vehicle and the multiradius element of the assembly is located proximal to the vehicle, as defined by claims 25-27.

Furthermore, reference is made to Fig. 2 of the Marhauer patent, which illustrates a side mirror ('18) having a mirror mount arm (unlabeled, extending from the lower right portion of the mirror). The side mirror includes a planar portion (7) and a curved portion (9, 10) adjacent to the planar portion.

Applicant: Gary Steven Strumolo, et al
Serial No.: 09/580,056
Attorney Docket No.: 199-2102

Based on a consideration of Fig. 2, it is apparent that, due to the lower right-handed position of the mirror mount arm, the Marhauer patent teaches that the planar portion (7) is to be positioned proximal to a vehicle on which the side mirror is mounted, whereas the curved portion (9', 10') is to be positioned distal to the vehicle.

The Marhauer patent fails to teach or suggest reversing this arrangement by providing the side mirror on a vehicle in such a manner that the planar portion (7) of the side mirror is located distal to the vehicle and the curved portion (9', 10,) of the side mirror is located proximal to the vehicle, as defined by claims 25-27.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the Marhauer patent would fail to provide any teaching, suggestion or motivation to a person of ordinary skill in the art to mount the Lynam reflective element assembly on a vehicle in such a manner that the plano element (50) of the assembly is located distal to the vehicle and the multiradius element (55) of the assembly is located proximal to the vehicle.


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Lynam in view of Marhauer fails to render claims 25-27 obvious within the contemplation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Reconsideration and allowance of claims 25-27 is therefore respectfully solicited.

Applicant: Gary Steven Strumolo, et al
Serial No.: 09/580,056
Attorney Docket No.: 199-2102

Conclusion

Every effort has been made to amend applicant's claims in order to define the invention in the scope to which it is entitled. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claims 21-27 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Randy W. Tung
Reg. No. 31,311